

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1141

Capital credits are passed on to the members using the electricity.

The only justification of governmental help is in areas where private business cannot or will not fill the need. This is the case when rural electric cooperatives were formed.

A corollary is that Government should pull out as rapidly as new enterprises can go it alone. It is good to know that the directors of the Cornbelt Electric Cooperative agree and that they are moving rapidly toward operation independent of the Federal Government.

Cuba
Case Against Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a committee of the Organization of American States has confirmed U.S. charges that Castro's Cuba trained and supplied the guerrillas who recently tried to overthrow the legal Government of Venezuela. It is evident that Castro's machinations pose a threat not so much to us as to our Latin American neighbors. It is our responsibility, however, to see that emerging democracies such as Venezuela can direct their resources toward economic development free from the harassment of Cuba-trained mercenaries. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the February 27 issue of the Washington Post which candidly points out the real danger of an ostrichlike attitude to Communist Cuba.

CASE AGAINST CUBA

The solemn judgment against Cuba handed down by a committee of the Organization of American States has one enormous virtue. It comes at a fortuitous moment when there is an increasing European tendency to shrug off Castro as a neurotic U.S. obsession—a tendency, it should be added, that fumbling diplomacy here has helped to abet. The OAS report makes it clear that Cuban subversion is not an empty fantasy, and that concern about Castro is not confined to the United States.

The record should underscore what is involved. Four influential Latin American countries, (Uruguay, Argentina, Costa Rica and Colombia) have joined with the United States in confirming charges that Cuba did indeed train guerrillas and ship arms with the purpose of overthrowing the elected Government of Venezuela.

European skeptics may well dismiss the charge, pointing out that the CIA also engaged in similar activities at the time of the Bay of Pigs. Yet it should be noted that the U.S.-backed effort, no matter how ineptly handled, was aimed at the restoration of democratic self-government in Cuba. It is one thing to say that the Cuban invasion was wrong in conception and execution, but quite another to excuse subversion practiced by a totalitarian dictatorship by equating it with support for prodemocratic Cuban exiles. Indeed, those who condemned the United States for its violation of international law are hardly in a position to wink away Cuban violation of exactly the same principle.

What is involved in Venezuela, let it be stressed, was not outside help to oppressed opponents of a brutal despotism. Rather, it

was outside help to terrorists whose chief aim was to destroy democracy in order to create the proper climate for guerrilla warfare. That effort failed, and a freely elected and progressively minded government remains in firm control of Venezuela.

Paradoxically, some countries—notably Brazil and Mexico—are using the fact of failure to justify inaction by the OAS. The terrorists were defeated, they say in effect, so why not forget about the whole thing? This is very much like excusing an attempted murder on the ground that the assassin had poor aim. Indeed, the same two countries did break relations with the Dominican Republic when it was demonstrated that the Trujillo dictatorship plotted an attempt to murder President Betancourt of Venezuela.

It is not yet clear what the OAS will do about the finding against Cuba. Certainly the United States ought to move carefully and avoid at all costs any showdown vote that would break the OAS. The OAS judgment provides an opportunity for some badly needed U.S. leadership in explaining that the dispute over Cuba does not involve the shipment of British buses to Havana—but instead the shipment of Belgian guns to Venezuela. Presented with force and maturity, this argument might help to shape a consensus that even Brazil and Mexico could support.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. It is with pride that I present herewith, for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, the speech written by my constituent, Miss Constance Cass of Alliance, Nebr. Miss Cass' speech won the State of Nebraska "Voice of Democracy" contest, and it will be one of those considered in the final judging for one of the four scholarships awarded by the Veterans of Foreign Wars who conduct this nationwide contest.

It is a pleasure to make this speech available to my colleagues. In these times, it is important for us all to pause and listen to the "Voice of Democracy":

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Connie Cass, Alliance, Nebr.)

On April 19, 1775, a shot rang out that was heard around the world. It was fired by the minutemen at Concord as they fought to free their country from the tight bonds of England.

On November 22, 1963, another shot was heard around the world; John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of our United States of America was assassinated. Lee Harvey Oswald, the man suspected of this assassination, was a citizen of this country for 24 years.

But this man was a citizen in name only. He moved about in the freest society on the face of this earth. So long as he did not violate the rights of others, he was privileged to think, do, and act as he liked. But while this underdeveloped, immature, and selfish person demanded his rights, he showed little concern for his responsibilities.

With the privileges and rights of citizenship, one of the highest honors bestowed on man, come some very important duties which must not be overlooked or someday

our children and grandchildren will grow up not knowing what it is like to be a citizen of a free country such as ours. Do we want to tell them how great our country used to be, or do we want to teach them how to preserve this great Government and to thank God that their fathers had enough knowledge to know their rights, and enough courage to accept their responsibilities.

How many of us ever consider citizenship as a challenge? We go through life thinking of citizenship as something owed to us because of our birth. But who is it that owes us this precious gift? Our fathers fought and died that our land and the people in it might be free. It is up to the true American citizens to persevere this great heritage.

Hence, an important challenge of citizenship is the exercising of our voting privileges so that we might select men who we think are well qualified economically, politically, and intellectually, to operate the machinery of our government. But as power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely. We have representatives to run our government, but there is little danger of their abusing this privilege if we preserve our constitutional checks and balances.

But the men who actually make the laws are not the only ones who have to obey them. Every citizen living within the boundaries of the United States or its territories must abide by these laws. The judicial branch of our Government is in charge of enforcing them for without sanction, there is no democracy.

The purpose of citizenship is the betterment of the lives of men and women, through the enlargement of their opportunities, and their intellectual, moral, and spiritual well-being. The glory of America is that it has held this vision for all the people. We must help each other keep America strong and free. We must be vigilant and conscious of our responsibilities to that heritage which is our Constitution. We must all work together to keep the spirit of America in the hearts of men and women who claim citizenship in this land. If we can keep this spirit, America will always be strong enough morally and physically, to withstand any type of attack that may be made. This is our challenge of citizenship.

H.R. 9652: In Defense of the
Defenseless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the 19th century English poetess, Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote:

The child's sob in the silence curses deeper than the strong man in his wrath. ("The Cry of the Children," 1844, stanza 13.)

All too often in today's society such sobbing may be the indication of injury inflicted by a man's or woman's wrath. I refer to the callous cases of child cruelty.

The physical abuse of children by their parents or others responsible for their care is clearly a crime, and appropriate statutes exist for the punishment of those found guilty of intentionally injuring a minor. However, many instances of child abuse never come to the attention of the authorities.

A1142

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 5

An editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle on February 11 discussed the criminal cases of outright cruelty which go undetected and the cause of their concealment. I quote an excerpt from this excellent editorial, entitled "Battered Children":

Because of their contacts with families, practicing physicians are closely related to the problem of medical neglect or physical abuse of minors. Yet many physicians do not want to refer such suspected cases to authorities because of the legal restrictions of the physician-patient relationship.

Mr. Speaker, this matter concerns me deeply, because it involves the need to protect those who cannot protect themselves. Further, it is a matter that concerns Congress, since child abuse legislation affecting the District of Columbia is presently pending in the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has introduced H.R. 9652, a bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children. I solidly support this legislative proposal.

I have the pleasure to serve as a member of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which the gentleman chairs. I know firsthand his dedicated desire to see this Congress enact legislation which would require doctors or hospitals to report suspected child abuse cases to the police. The bill would require such reporting and would guarantee immunity from legal suits for those making the reports.

It should be noted that this measure has gained editorial support from an important broadcasting company in Washington. In early February, WMAL, WMAL-FM, and WMAL-TV offered the following statement of opinion to their viewers and listeners:

CHILD ABUSE

The Commissioners have, quite rightly, ordered the Corporation Counsel's office to draft corrective child abuse legislation. Congressman MULTER, of New York, has already introduced a bill to provide mandatory medical reports of suspected physical abuse cases.

The Multer bill would require doctors to report suspected cases to police and would grant legal immunity to doctors from any civil or criminal action that resulted from their reports.

Ten States now have child abuse laws. Children of the District need similar protection.

We have repeatedly urged legislation to cure this repugnant crime. A WMAL news and public affairs documentary last December proved the dire need to protect children against willful physical abuse and led to the proposed legislation.

The House District Committee should receive in the near future a child abuse bill from the Commissioners. We hope the bill is compatible with Congressman MULTER's bill, so lengthy hearings will be unnecessary. Swift passage of corrective legislation is plainly in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the House will acquaint themselves with the problem of child abuse in the District of Columbia and pledge their support to the early enactment of H.R. 9652 in order to provide for the protection of children who suffer at the hands of angry adults.

AN Odor of Police-State Methods**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****OR****HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE****OF NEW YORK****IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES****Thursday, March 5, 1964**

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. William S. White appeared in the Washington Post of March 4.

Mr. White does well to call our attention to the gradual use and acceptance of police-state methods in the United States. This, of course, is in direct contravention of the fourth amendment to the Constitution written in the Bill of Rights, which reads:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The law and civil rights are applicable to all citizens, not just to the good guys. The law is supposed to be blind and metes out justice with equity to all alike.

The column referred to follows:

AN ODOR OF POLICE-STATE METHODS

(By William S. White)

An unpleasant odor of police-state methods—of instances of illegal wiretapping and of Federal snooping over the mail of private persons—is arising from the vicinity of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The victims of these episodes have been, of course, either highly unpopular or even "bad" men, in the minds of many. This superficial circumstance, however, is wholly irrelevant to the deep, root fact that this abuse of the Federal investigative power is fundamentally alien to a free society. It is mortally offensive to the constitutional guarantees of freedom and privacy which above all it is the same Justice Department's responsibility to shelter rather than attack.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the Department's head, owes a duty to his position and to the American tradition not simply to put a stop at once to every form of this unfairness. It is his obligation as well to punish those officials involved in it—resolutely and pitilessly.

HAS HIGHER FUNCTION

For the Department of Justice has one function even higher than that of fighting crime and subversion. This is the lofty duty to protect and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the people—including the bad people—under it.

Though there is no evidence that the Justice Department has been running actually wild in this area, it is all the same a fact that recent examples of extra-legal Federal action against so-called baddies are troubling many reasonable men, most notably in the U.S. Senate.

Roy Cohn, the New York lawyer under federal indictment on perjury and conspiracy charges, complains that his mail is under Government surveillance—a clear and undeniable violation of his basic rights as a defendant in a criminal case brought against him by that same Government. Justice Department spokesmen first deny any Federal mail watch on their behalf. Subsequently, they are compelled to admit the truth of Cohn's complaint; they then blame it on an assistant Federal prosecutor.

A Federal judge, Archie O. Dawson, feels

obliged publicly to denounce the incident as "shocking"—as indeed it is, in spite of the fact that Cohn in his day was an eager part of the pack of professional accusers of other men who gathered around the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin.

Edward Levinson, a Las Vegas, Nev., gambler—albeit, a perfectly legal gambler under the laws of that State—says before a Senate committee investigating the Bobby Baker case that Federal authorities "bugged" his telephones. This sort of thing has repeatedly been condemned by the courts of this country as a dirty business.

It is disclosed at the same time by United Press International that Nevada Members of Congress had gone to President Johnson—himself a lifelong antagonist of all forms of illicit Federal snooping—to protest reported Federal wiretapping in both Las Vegas and Reno, even before the Levinson affair. UPI reports that Senator HOWARD CANNON, of Nevada, had then been assured by a Justice Department official that there would be no Federal wiretapping in that State.

HANDED SUBPENA

And to add to all this unpleasant and disturbing business, Levinson, in the midst of his appearance before the committee in the Baker case, is handed a subpoena in an income-tax investigation by a Federal agent who invades the very Senate without its knowledge or permission to work this blatantly intimidating unfairness to a Senate witness.

The point to be stressed in all this is that good intentions are no substitutes for correct Federal procedures. For unless the constitutional rights of all of us—including, and even particularly including the Cohns and Levinsons, whatever their real or alleged sins—are kept safe, the rights of none of us can be guaranteed in the end.

The understandable and proper desire of Federal agents and prosecutors to enforce the law must not be further confused with the fateful duty of these agents and prosecutors to uphold something else called the Constitution of the United States.

Pearson's Whitewash of L.B.J.**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****OR****HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL****OF ILLINOIS****IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES****Thursday, March 5, 1964**

Mrs. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times has carried Columnist Drew Pearson's column for a good many years. In their issue of March 2, 1964, they expressed their concern over Columnist Drew Pearson's whitewash of the Bobby Baker scandal. The Capital Times editorial, entitled "We Don't Go Along With Pearson's Whitewash of L.B.J." follows:

WE DON'T GO ALONG WITH PEARSON'S WHITEWASH OF L.B.J.

Elsewhere on this page will be found an article by Drew Pearson in which he gives President Johnson a clean bill of health in the Bobby Baker scandal.

Pearson has occupied a curious role in this investigation. He is usually taking the lead in exposing wrongdoing in Government. But in the Baker scandal his efforts have been aimed principally at exposing the witness who has made the most damning case against the President's tieup with Baker—Don Reynolds.

The Capital Times does not go along with the Pearson effort to absolve the President